



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

X

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/933,861	08/20/2001	Rajesh Bhatia	BIZ/01-0008	7426
22874	7590	02/09/2006	EXAMINER	
GANZ LAW, P.C. P O BOX 2200 HILLSBORO, OR 97123			DUNHAM, JASON B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3625	
DATE MAILED: 02/09/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/933,861	BHATIA ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Jason B. Dunham	3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/04/2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 26-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/05/2004.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election of Group II without traverse on November 4<sup>th</sup>, 2005 is noted.
2. Claims 1-25 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected groups, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**Claims 26-34,36-48, & 50-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Geddes (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0192870).**

Referring to claim 26. Geddes discloses a method for context personal browsing comprising:

- Providing a remote computer system, the remote computer system receiving data from a client computer system having a browser companion agent including one or more than one associated service modules that assist a user of the client computer system by providing services that are contextually relevant to content on a browser on the client computer system, the data received by the remote

computer system being determined according to the content page present on a browser of the client computer system or the user associated with the client computer system (Geddes: abstract & paragraphs 77-79);

- Determining from the page data at least one set of data or executable code that corresponds to a service module associated with the browser companion agent (Geddes: paragraphs 102-103 & figures 8-9). The examiner notes that Geddes discloses an “intent interpreter”, which consists of an interface, equivalent to the browser companion agent and a collection of data structures, equivalent to the service module.
- Sending the data or code to the browser companion agent for use by the service module (Geddes: paragraph 17).

Referring to claim 27. Geddes further discloses a method wherein the service module is a comparison shopping service (Geddes: paragraph 9).

Referring to claim 28. Geddes further discloses a method wherein the browser companion agent includes at least two of the service modules (Geddes: paragraph 70).

Referring to claim 29. Geddes further discloses a method wherein the data or code sent to the browser companion agent is determined by parsing the page for elements matching elements in a database, the elements in the database corresponding to the code or data to send to the remote computer system (Geddes: paragraph 77).

Referring to claim 30. Geddes further discloses a method wherein the data or code sent to the browser companion agent is determined by looking up in a database

corresponding code or data to send to the remote computer system (Geddes: paragraph 96).

Referring to claim 31-34. Claims 31-34 are rejected under the same rationale as set forth above.

Referring to claim 36. Geddes further discloses a method wherein the browser comprises a version of Internet explorer and the companion agent comprises a browser helper object (Geddes: paragraph 71).

Referring to claims 37-38. Geddes further discloses a method wherein the data sent to the remote computer system comprises the location identifier for a page on the browser of the client computer system (Geddes: paragraphs 86-87) and wherein the location identifier comprises a URL for the page (Geddes: paragraphs 86-87). The examiner notes that Geddes discloses a method wherein the agent monitors the user's actions while browsing the web as the user changes sites. By monitoring the user's actions, the agent would inherently record the URL for each page surfed.

Referring to claims 39-40. Geddes further discloses a method wherein the data sent to the remote computer system comprises data about the content or structure on the page on the browser of the client computer system (Geddes: paragraphs 86-87).

Referring to claim 41. Geddes further discloses a method comprising:

- From a first computer system, sending a service module for context personalized browsing comprising executable code to a second computer system, the second computer system including a browser companion agent comprising a service component for holding one or more service modules, a service module

comprising code relating to providing a user of the second computer system information relating to an actual or potential e-commerce transaction (Geddes: abstract, paragraphs 77-79, claim 29);

- A data component for holding data related to one or more service modules (Geddes: paragraphs 102-103 & figures 8-9);
- A tracking component for tracking the domain of a page presented on a browser and communicating page domain data to a remote computer system (Geddes: paragraph 114);
- A receiving component for receiving data from the remote computer system responsive to the page domain data, the service module being installable in the service component of the second computer system, the service module being sent to the second computer system also being useful to a user considering an e-commerce transaction (Geddes: paragraphs 91 & 114).

Referring to claim 42. Geddes further discloses a method wherein the agent includes a user interface that is coupable to a browser, the user interface capable of receiving user input and sending the input to a remote computer system or displaying information received from a remote computer system (Geddes: abstract & paragraph 51).

Referring to claim 43-48 & 50. Claims 43-48 and 50 are rejected under the same rationale as set forth above.

Referring to claim 51. Geddes further discloses a method wherein the services are invoked in a predetermined order based on assigned priorities (Geddes: abstract &

paragraphs 41-42). The examiner notes that Geddes discloses using a partial order planner.

Referring to claim 52-53. Geddes further discloses a method wherein the priority is assignable by the remote computer system or is set by one of the services (Geddes: paragraphs 72-73).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 35 & 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geddes (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0192870) in view of Beck (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,139) .**

Referring to claims 35 & 49. Geddes discloses all of the above as noted in the 102(e) rejection but does not expressly discloses a method wherein a data or service module comprises a COM object. Beck discloses a method wherein a service module comprises a COM object (Beck: abstract, paragraphs 55-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified the method of Geddes to have included data or service modules comprising a COM object, as taught by Beck, in order to interact with other electronic commerce applications (Beck: paragraph 56).

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Liou (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0059395) discloses a system and method for providing a user interface for product exploration.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason B. Dunham whose telephone number is 571-272-8109. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wynn Coggins can be reached on 571-272-7159. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



JBD  
Patent Examiner  
2/6/06